Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

	OFFICE OF SECRETARY OFFICE OF SECRETARY		
In the Matter of)		OFFICE OF SECRETARY
)		SELKETARY
Assessment and Collection)	MD Docket No. 95-3	
of Regulatory Fees for)		
Fiscal Year 1995)		

REPLY COMMENTS OF MFS COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC.

MFS Communications Company, Inc. ("MFS"), by its undersigned counsel, hereby submits its Reply Comments in the above-captioned proceeding. The Commission's *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* seeks to modify the regulatory fees imposed upon competitive access providers ("CAPs") and other common carrier telecommunication service providers. Specifically, the Commission seeks comment on two proposed methods for calculating regulatory fees. The initial comments of MFS maintained that both of the Commission's alternatives would result in a massive increase in the regulatory fees imposed on CAPs and thereby reduce their ability to compete with incumbents for the provision of service. Furthermore, MFS questioned the speculative nature of the Commission's regulatory fee methodology and concluded that both of the Commission's proposed fee mechanisms would be difficult to implement and require additional burdensome reporting requirements. Accordingly, MFS strongly supported the a revenue based fee model as a fair, simple, and equitable alternative to the Commission's proposed fee calculation methodologies.

Many commenters support a revenue based fee model. Comments of Teleport Communication's Group, Inc. ("TCG"); Comments of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc. ("NECA"); Comments of AT&T; Comments of Cablevision Lightpath ("Lightpath");

No. of Copies recid_ List ABCDE Comments of US West; Comments SouthWestern Bell Corporation ("SWB"). These commenters find both of the Commission's proposed alternatives to be an impediment to competition, speculative, inequitable, and impractical or burdensome to administer. *See* Comments of Cablevision Lightpath, Inc. ("Cablevision") at 1-2; Comments of TCG at 4; Comments of the National Exchange Carrier Association ("NECA") at 4.

In general, competitive carriers expressed concern regarding the tremendous increase in the regulatory fees under either of the Commission's proposals. For example, Cablevision indicates that its regulatory fees would increase over 200%. Comments of Cablevision at 3. ALTS states that regulatory fees for some of its competitive local exchange and access provider members could increase by 440,000%. Comments of ALTS at 4. Furthermore, TCG and Cablevision both point out how either of the Commission's proposed alternatives, when applied, would "tax" CAPs to a greater extent than other telecommunications providers. Comments of TCG at 2-4. TCG notes, for example, a CAP "minute" or "line" represents a much smaller revenue opportunity than a LEC minute or line because a LEC has a greater opportunity to bundle a number of additional services and thereby generate much more revenue for each line or minute of usage provided. Comments of TCG at 2-3. Furthermore, Cablevision aptly notes that the Commission's decision to employ voice-grade circuits to determine the number of customer units unduly shifts the rate paying burden to CAPs and other data service providers. Comments of Cablevision at 4.

MFS joins commenting parties in suggesting that the Commission reconsider its proposed rate assessment methodology in light of the undue burden it would impose upon CAPs. MFS joins Cablevision, TCG, and others in suggesting that the imposition of the current proposals

could threaten CAPs' critical competitive position in the marketplace. MFS concurs with TCG's position that the imposition of a disproportionate fee burden upon CAPs is particularly unfair "given that CAPs operate in a regulatory environment where barriers to entry remain high in most states, where CAPs have attracted only a small percentage of the revenues associated with interstate communication services, and where CAPs do not have all the same revenue streams available to support their investments that local exchange carriers do." Comments of TCG at 5. The disparity in regulatory fees proposed for CAPs, as compared to the proposed fees for LECs are particularly troublesome considering that CAPs not only supplement existing LEC facilities but provide otherwise captive ratepayers a choice of providers and the inherent benefits that derive therefrom. *Id.*

Furthermore, MFS concurs with the general assessment of commenters that either method of fee assessment proposed by the Commission would be speculative and be too burdensome and impractical to administer. *See, e.g.* Comments of Cablevision at 1-2; Comments of NECA at 4; Comments of TCG at 4. MFS finds that the minutes of use ("MOU") and per-line fee assessment proposals are flawed, based on questionable assumptions and not supported by record evidence. *See* Comments of AT&T at 7; Comments of SWB at 6; Comments of NECA at 3. For example, NECA notes that MOU data has wide monthly variations, limited verifiability and may not reflect current customer composition. Comments of NECA at 3. Similarly, because of the flux in usage patterns, the extrapolation of customer unit data on the basis of historical data would also be unreasonable speculative. Comments of MFS at 4-5. In order to remedy the speculative nature of these fee mechanisms, the Commission would need to impose yet another burdensome reporting requirement. NECA, which has considerable experience with Fund administration

notes, for example, that the imposition of a line based fee mechanism will "add complex administrative procedures and methodologies" to determine the necessary line information. Comments of NECA at 2. In addition, NECA notes that the Commission's MOU based fee proposal is "administratively burdensome" and "does not promote efficiency." Comments of NECA at 3.

Accordingly, as the record demonstrates that the Commission's proposed alternatives would impose disproportionate and onerous costs and reporting requirements upon CAPs, MFS respectfully requests that the Commission adopt a revenue based fee structure. A revenue based fee is simple, straightforward, and would avoid the inequities inherent in the application of either the per-line or MOU alternatives.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andrew D. Lipman

William B. Wilhelm, Jr.

SWIDLER & BERLIN, Chartered

3000 K Street, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20007

(202) 424-7500

Attorneys for MFS Communications Company

February 28, 1995

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 28th day of February, 1995, copies of the foregoing REPLY COMMENTS OF MFS COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC., MD DOCKET NO. 95-3, were sent by first-class mail to the following:

VIA HAND DELIVERY

William F. Caton Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Room 222 Washington, D.C. 20554

Peter W. Herrick
Acting Associate Managing Director,
Program Analysis
Federal Communications Commissions
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 528
Washington, D.C. 20554

Andrew S. Fishel
Managing Director
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 852
Washington, D.C. 20554

International Transcription Services 1919 M Street, N.W. Room 246 Washington, D.C. 20554

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

Paul J. Sinderbrand Sinderbrand & Alexander 888 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Fifth Floor Washington, D.C. 20006-4103

James P. Wagner P.O. Box 621 Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

Mark J. Golden
Vice President - Industry Affairs
Personal Communications Industry
Association
1019 Nineteenth Street, Suite 1100
Washington D.C. 20036

Charles C. Hunter Hunter & Mow, P.C. 1620 I Street, N.W. Suite 701 Washington, D.C. 20006

Charles H. Helein Helein & Waysdorf, P.C. 1850 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Albert H. Kramer Robert F. Aldrich Keck, Mahin & Cate 1201 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554 Andre J. Lachance 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1200 Washington, D.C. 20036

Danny E. Adams
Steven A. Augustino
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Jacqueline E. Holmes Nethersole Edward R. Wholl 120 Bloomingdale Road White Plains, New York 10605

Don Sussman
Regulatory Analyst
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Lawrence N. Cohn
Cohn and Marks
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036

Clifford M. Hunter Broadcast Media Associates 316 California Avenue, Suite 700 Reno, Nevada 89509

Glenn S. Rabin Federal Regulatory Attorney 655 15th Street, N.W. Suite 220 Washington, D.C. 20005

Christopher D. Imlay Booth, Freret & Imlay 1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 204 Washington, D.C. 20036 Randolph J. May Timothy J. Cooney Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-0100

Richard J. Metzger Pierson & Tuttle 1200 19th Street, N.W. Suite 607 Washington, D.C. 20036

Michael E. Glover Edward Shakin 1320 North Court House Road Arlington, Virginia 22201

Frank M. Panek Attorney for Ameritech Room 4H84 2000 West Ameritech Center Drive Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

David M. Hunsaker
John C. Trent
Putbrese & Hunsaker
6800 Fleetwood Road, Suite 100
P.O. Box
McLean, Virginia 22101-0539

Kenneth M. Maness, President Bloomington Broadcasting Corp. P.O. Box 8 Bloomington, Illinois 61701

Richard Dills, President Northern Broadcast, Inc. 2215 Oak Industrial Drive, NE Grand Rapids, Michigan 49505

Susan W. Smith
Director of External Affairs
Century Cellunet, Inc.
100 Century Park Drive
Monroe, Louisiana 71203

Gregory P. Jablonski
President
The Livingston Radio Company
Stations WHMI-AM-FM
P.O. Box 935
Howell, MI 48844

Brian M. Madden Nancy A. Ory Leventhal, Senter & Lerman 2000 K Street, N.W. Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20006-1809

Vincent J. Curtis, Jr.
Howard M. Weiss
Anne Goodwin Crump
Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C.
1300 North 17th Street
Eleventh Floor
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

Henry J. Baumann
Jack N. Goodman
National Association of Broadcasters
1771 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Raul R. Rodriguez
Stephen D. Baruch
David S. Keir
J. Breck Blalock
Leventhal, Senter & Lerman
2000 K Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20006

Stephen R. Effros
James H. Ewalt
Robert J. Ungar
The Cable Telecommunications
Association
3950 Chain Bridge Road
P.O. Box 1005
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-1005

Dennis J. Kelly Cordon and Kelly P.O. Box 6648 Annapolis, MD 21401

Don R. Chaney, President Stellar Communications, Inc. P.O. Box 130970 Tyler, Texas 75713-0970

Grover C. Cooper
Lauren Ann Lynch
Robert L. Galbreath
Fisher, Wayland Cooper Leader
& Zaragoza L.L. P.
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20006

Katherine M. Holden Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Anne E. Mickey John W. Butler Sher & Blackwell Suite 612 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Daniel L. Brenner Neal M. Goldberg Diane B. Burstein 1724 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 Andrea D. Williams
Michael F. Altschul
Cellular Telecommunications
Industry Association
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert A. Mansbach 6560 Rock Spring Drive Bethesda, Maryland 20817

Catherine R. Sloan
Richard L. Fruchterman
Richard S. Whitt
LDDS Communications, Inc.
1825 Eye Street, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20006

Donna C. Gregg Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Michael E. Glover Edward Shakin 1320 North Court House Road Arlington, Virginia 22201 Richard J. Metzger Pierson & Tuttle 1200 19th Street, N.W. Suite 607 Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert M. Lynch Mary W. Marks 175 E. Houston Room 1262 San Antonio, Texas 78205 Jodie L. Donovan
Senior Regulatory Counsel
Teleport Communications Group, Inc.
Two Lafayette Centre
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mark C. Rosenblum Robert J. McKee Judy Sello Room 3244J1 295 North Maple Avenue Basking Ridge, New Jersey 07920

Jay C. Keithley Leon M. Kestenbaum 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20036

Craig T. Smith P.O. Box 11315 Kansas City, MO 64112 Joanne Salvatore Bochis 100 South Jefferson Road Whippany, New Jersey 07981 Henry Goldberg Joseph A. Godles Daniel S. Goldberg Goldberg, Godles, Wiener & Wright 1229 Nineteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

William B. Wilhelm, Jr.